Human Security and Citizenship in Finnish Religious Education : Rethinking Security within the Human Rights Horizon

Adebayo, Gabriel O

2018-03-13

Adebayo , G O & Mansikka , J-E 2018 , ' Human Security and Citizenship in Finnish Religious Education : Rethinking Security within the Human Rights Horizon ' , Human rights review , vol. 19 , no. 4 , pp. 447-469 . https://doi.org/10.1007/s12142-018-0502-x

http://hdl.handle.net/10138/324260
https://doi.org/10.1007/s12142-018-0502-x

unspecified
acceptedVersion

Human Security and Citizenship in Finnish Religious Education: Rethinking Security within the Human Rights Horizon

Gabriel O. Adebayo & Jan-Erik Mansikka

Abstract

This paper discusses citizenship in Finnish religious education (RE) in relation to human security. It traces the characteristics of human security that connect citizenship, religion, and education in Finnish policy documents. The article focuses on basic education (grades 7–9). Its data were analyzed employing qualitative content analysis (QCA). The findings indicate that citizenship in Finnish RE entails personal security concerns dealing with psychological and human rights issues. These are found to be essentially human security as conceptualized by the United Nations (UN). However, Finnish policy documents sparingly utilize human security in explicit terms. Finland rather emphasizes the practical applications of human security. Incorporation of explicit global citizen and human rights issues into RE in the new Finnish curriculum seems to project critical global citizenship. This is found to promote human security. Following Finland's bid for practical application of human security, we recommend (but cautiously) that human security be explicitly integrated into the Finnish RE curriculum.

Keywords: citizenship; curriculum; diversity; human rights; human security; religious education

Introduction

Until recently, religion had often been considered to have nothing to contribute to security issues. Whenever religion is examined in the context of security, views about it are often negative, at least in the West (Hoover 2004; Davies 2014). This seems connected to increasing secularism in the West and religion-associated attacks such as the 9/11 attack against the US (Hoover 2004; Seiple et al., 2013). However, recent policy developments about human security have significantly associated security with religion, thus moving security beyond the myopic focus on "state security." In relation to human security, religion is not just a security threat, it is also a solution to security concerns. Human security is not just about protecting material things but also about ensuring human rights and mental and emotional security (Lombardi and Wellman, 2012; United Nations Development Programme – UNDP 1994). The political use of RE[1] for security has recently been of research interest in Europe, the US and among international organizations such as the UN and the Organization

[1] In this article, RE means the study of religion as a core subject in public schools.

for Security and Cooperation in Europe – OSCE[2] (Gearon 2013). The use of RE to promote security is based on the belief that it has the potential to promote tolerance, intercultural understanding, and democratic citizenship (OSCE 2007).

The use of RE for security by many governments is often benign in intention. As such, we believe that the provision on citizenship in RE in Finnish public schools is for security purposes benign in intention (cf. Gearon 2013). A major aim of this study is to challenge the conventional assumptions that hastily describe religion, security, citizenship, and education as incompatible (cf. Seiple et al. 2013). We seek the nexus between religion and security in the context of citizenship in Finnish RE. There is generally a lack of security perspectives in the study of citizenship in Finnish RE. Hence, this study seeks to make a small contribution to filling this gap. We seek to lay a foundation for theoretical development and empirical analysis about security and RE in the Finnish context. We attempt to enhance our understanding of the recently reinvigorated relationship between education and security (Ghosh et al. 2016).

Weisse (2007) notes that the dangers arising from religious isolation, confrontation, and mobilization for political purpose are obvious. He adds, however, that religious values can also help to promote the peaceful coexistence of various religions and to justify respect for human dignity, irrespective of one's political and religious convictions. Accordingly, they can act as elements of civility. The tension between dialogue and conflict relating to religion has given rise to security-related studies in RE (Weisse 2007, 9-13), although security may not be an explicit central concept in such studies (cf. Gearon 2013, 136). The research project, REDCo[3] is an example of implicit security studies in RE (Weisse 2007). We believe that covert study of security in RE would not adequately enhance our understanding of the subject matter.

Hence, we use an overt approach in studying security in RE in this study. We are sympathetic to the UN perspective of human security (UNDP 1994) whereby personal security finds its expression (Gasper 2005). Accordingly, selected policy documents of the

[2] The OSCE was formerly known as the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe and it effectively began in 1975 following the Helsinki Final Act. It is now the world's largest regional security organization (OSCE 2007, 21–22).

[3] REDCo Means: "Religion in Education: A contribution to Dialogue or a factor of Conflict in transforming societies of European countries" (Weisse 2007).

UN and its agencies are employed in this research.[4] We seek to answer the following research questions:

1. What kind of security concerns can one find in relation to Finnish RE as one analyzes the policy documents of Finland?
2. What is the relationship between religion, citizenship, education, and security in Finnish RE in the light of the selected intergovernmental policy documents?

Structurally, the next section in this paper deals with our research focus and methodology. Subsequently, we review religion and human security as our conceptual framework. We then account for the theoretical background of the study dealing with security, human security, citizenship, and religion in education outside and inside Finland. We review the debates relating to religion in the widening of security concerns and illuminate the debates relating to security and/or human security in RE. We thereafter highlight the scope and limitations of this study. Following this are the analysis of the results from the policy documents and a concluding discussion.

Focus and Methodology

Our research examines human security in matters relating to citizenship in RE in Finnish basic education (grades 7–9).[5] The data come from Finnish national policy documents and they are analyzed/discussed in relation to some relevant UN (transnational) policy documents. We focus on citizenship in Finnish RE in relation to the transnational policies with a view to projecting human security as an emergent issue in the Finnish security approach. This is premised on the fact that Finland acknowledges that security policy, in this changing world, applies not only to military issues but also to any internal and external factors affecting the welfare and security of Finnish society. Besides, the Finnish goal is "based on respect for the common values and principles agreed to in the United Nations … and on concerted action to uphold them" (Ministry for Foreign Affairs – MFA 1995, 5; Prime Minister's Office – PMO 2013).

The Finnish policy documents employed in this research are the previous National Core Curriculum for Basic Education (NCCBE) and the new NCCBE (i.e., FNBE 2014;

[4] See below for the reason for employing the UN policy about human security in the "Focus and Methodology" section.

[5] The entire Finnish basic education ranges from grades 1–9 (Finnish National Board of Education – FNBE 2014, 27). It is compulsory, and it usually begins when the child turns seven (Section 25 of the Basic Education Act 628/1998; Amendments up to 1136/2010). (See: http://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/kaannokset/1998/en19980628.pdf. Accessed 31 December 2017.)

2004), government resolutions, policies, and reports of the government committees[6] dealing with security and defense, future migration, prevention of violent extremism, human rights, and education (i.e., Security and Defence Committee 2006; Ministry of the Interior (MoI) 2008, 2012, 2013; PMO 2013; MFA 2004, 2009, 2014). The national policy document analysis is illuminated with some transnational (UN and its agencies) policy documents: the 1994 and 2009 human development reports of the UNDP (UNDP 1994, 2009), *Human security now* (Commission on Human Security 2003), and a UN authorized report on freedom of religion or belief (UN 2010).

We use qualitative content analysis (QCA) to analyze our data. QCA is a method for systematically describing the meanings of qualitative materials (e.g., documents). This is usually done by classifying materials into relevant categories of a coding frame (Schreier 2012, 1–3; Berg 2009, 338–339). QCA can involve both manifest contents (self-evident elements/themes) and latent contents (existing but not yet well-developed elements/themes) of the materials that may be under examination (Bryman 2004, 392; Berg 2009, 343–345). Usually, QCA implicitly assumes a realist assumption. Hence, it suggests that there is a sort of reality represented within (not outside) the materials that one may be studying. The reality representation is assumed to have, for example, certain attitudes and feelings that may be held by participants (e.g., the authors of the documents) (Schreier 2012, 47).

In this study, we utilize the manifest and latent contents as we classify the selected documents into instances of categories that can help us make a nexus between human security, citizenship, religion, and education. As such, we track the Finnish government's feelings/attitudes aiming at facilitating human security through citizenship in Finnish RE. Meanwhile, the idea of combining manifest and latent contents in order to realize the nexus between our phenomena of concern is significant because human security (as later explicated in this article) is yet to enjoy explicit wide currency in Finnish documents, unlike in the UN and its agencies' documents. We strengthen our analysis by following the principles of our coding frame in QCA, as we use a concept-driven strategy (building on what we know already) and a data-driven strategy (letting the categories emerge from the selected

[6] The Finnish government usually employs the institution of various committees to bring education under its strict control. They help in planning government actions and in drafting government policies affecting the whole education sector. The proposals of these committees are more or less official curricula. So, the committees are vital instruments of educational policy as practiced by the state (Simola 2000, 2114–2115). As becomes apparent later in this study, the reports of the committees across various sectors/ministries are usually considered and harmonized in the making of curriculum for basic (compulsory) education (cf. ibid.).

documents) to shape the dimensions employed in describing our data and to generate subcategories for each dimension. As such, we relate the data generated from our primary documents with the concepts/theories in our conceptual framework and in the previous research in our analysis (cf. Schreier 2012, 84–86).

We seek meanings from the documents from a realist rather than from a constructivist[7] viewpoint so as to focus on the contents of the documents. We do not claim that the meanings we make of the documents are absolute. However, we maintain the trustworthiness (a sort of validity in qualitative research) for this study by ensuring that our personal values and theoretical inclinations do not overshadow the research methods and findings (Bryman 2004, 273–276; Schreier 2012, 34). We find QCA appropriate for our study because our research questions are descriptively focused. As such, we examine "what" (not "how") the representations of the phenomena relating to our research questions look like. As QCA requires, the analysis and discussion in this article are typically descriptive (i.e., uncritical). (See Schreier 2012, 47.)

Conceptual Framework

Religion and Human Security

Security is often associated with the military and intelligence relating to state security in which the major actors are the sovereign states. However, human security goes beyond state security, as it posits that security is not restricted to the absence of threats to national territory and its institutions (Davies 2014; Seiple et al. 2013; Hoover 2004). For human security, a feeling of insecurity for most people today "arises more from worries about daily life than from the dread of a cataclysmic world event" (UNDP 1994, 22).

The intellectual root of the modern human security movement could be traced to the 1941 "Four Freedoms" speech of US President Franklin Roosevelt (Lombardi and Wellman 2012, 3). In that speech, Roosevelt articulated a liberal vision that was different from the totalitarian ideologies of the fascist and the communist countries of his day (ibid.). For Roosevelt, people all over the world should have the right to enjoy "four essential human freedoms": "freedom of speech and expression," "freedom of every person to worship God in his own way" [i.e., freedom of religion], "freedom from want," and "freedom from fear"

[7] The constructivist perspective belongs to discourse analysis in which linguistic categories within and outside the materials under examination shape the interpretation of the social reality (Schreier 2012, 47). Implicit realist assumption, by contrast, is of QCA and it mainly concerns the reality that can be found in the materials under investigation. Generally, the realist assumption would not consider the relationship between the linguistic categories of the materials under analysis and the social reality (ibid.).

(Roosevelt 1941).[8] Lombardi and Wellman (2012) observed that these freedoms were, however, subjugated during the Cold War, and hence sparked a concern among the international security organizations to find a joint program that could guarantee them in the world. They stated further that the concern to attain human security based on the "Four Freedoms" speech did not subside even after the Cold War.

The OSCE, from its inception in 1975, has been a structure for bringing together Cold War rivals. Until it became the world's largest regional security organization, the OSCE contributed to the framing of the concepts related to the "human dimension" of security. It usually seeks consensus on resolution of differences and prevention of conflict. Following article VII of the Helsinki Final Act of the OSCE, respect for human rights and freedom of religion/belief are part of the fundamental principles guiding the participating states (OSCE 2007, 21–22). For the OSCE, the human dimension of security is as important as the politico-military perspectives of security. As such, it is part of the organization's broad and comprehensive concept of security whereby human rights, the rule of law and democracy are recognized as fundamentals of security (MFA 2009 76). Accordingly, the human dimension of the OSCE seems to share values with President Roosevelt's "Four Freedoms" speech. It also appears to be a precursor of the human security promoted by the UN. Moreover, the human dimension of the OSCE suggests that there is an intrinsic relationship between citizenship and security in RE.[9]

The search for adequate security among international security organizations leads to an understanding that national security cannot be attained without human security. Hence, a watershed policy on "New Dimensions of Human Security" was published in the UNDP *Human Development Report* in 1994 (Lombardi and Wellman 2012).

Human security deals with how people live (UNDP 1994). It entails people's access to social justice; human rights; freedom from violence; freedom from fear; and access to education, health, and water (ibid.; Davies 2014). Therefore, human security can be defined as the protection of individuals from risks or threats to their physical or psychological safety, dignity, and well-being (Tadjabakhsh and Chenoy 2007, 3).[10] Following Seiple et al. (2013), human security creates ample room for religion and religious non-state actors and freedom of religion in private and public lives. Here, security is not perceived as a mere absence of

[8] See: https://fdrlibrary.org/documents/356632/390886/readingcopy.pdf/42234a77-8127-4015-95af-bcf831db311d. Accessed 5 May 2016.

[9] See more details about this in the latter part of this conceptual framework.

[10] Human security has many conflicting definitions, as it is multifaceted (Tadjabakhsh and Chenoy 2007).

impending threats to physical safety but also as the presence of the conditions necessary for long term stability, peace, and well-being. Thus, human security indicates the inevitable connections between a failure to meet the core human needs and the possibility of violent conflicts. For them, the freedom to adopt/practice religion or to reject it is a core human need in terms of security.

Accordingly, human security seeks to afford individuals the opportunity to live and lead self-determined lives. Human security adds values to security issues, as it poses new questions for the problem of security: "security of whom?" "security from what?" and "security by what means?" (Tadjabakhsh and Chenoy 2007, 13–19; cf. Gasper 2005, 224–225). On security of whom, human security designates individual(s) rather than the state as the referent object of security. It emphasizes personal security.[11] It posits that state security is insufficient in an era when most violent conflicts are intra-state (not inter-state) and, overwhelmingly, most casualties are civilians. Yet human security does not abrogate state security; it complements it (Tadjabakhsh and Chenoy 2007, 13; Gasper 2005, 225). On security from what, human security is designed to recognize menaces beyond violence to a host of other specific but interconnected threats such as personal security threats, political security threats, and socio-economic security threats among others. These security threats are generally associated with freedom from fear and from want (Tadjabakhsh and Chenoy 2007, 14–17). On security by what means, human security recognizes that no forms of threat and violence can be addressed in isolation owing to the interconnectedness of security challenges. Hence, all actors must employ different means to address menaces (Ibid., 18–19).

Religion impacts beliefs in a manner that influences political and private behavior. This affects the foreign and domestic policies of many countries, which in turn impact the human security of both believers and nonbelievers. For instance, evangelical Christianity influences the private and political behavior of the US; the Islamic spiritual revival in the second half of the twentieth century brought about official policies of legal reforms aiming to harmonize state laws with Islamic values in many Muslim countries (Lombardi and Wellman 2012, 10).

Lombardi and Wellman (2012) claim that the impacts (positive and negative) of religion on human security are obvious. For instance, the recent global religious revival was

[11] There are other different but interwoven forms of human security (e.g., socio-economic security, environmental security, political security etc.). However, they all revolved around personal security (Gasper 2005).

supposedly thought to have led to a rise in religious violence. Conversely, the role of religion and religious actors in mediating peace agreements (over religious and nonreligious conflicts) around the world project religion and its actors as capable of enhancing peace and human security. Negatively or positively, "there is a clear connection between religion and the material aspects of human security" (Lombardi and Wellman 2012, 10). Religion also has major impacts on the less material components of human security such as human rights. This is true in the sense that religions construct ethical systems that influence the behavior of government and communities. Hence, it could help ascertain whether people in a given state or community enjoy the privileges recognized internationally as fundamental human rights. It goes further in that if mental and emotional well-being are elements of human security, then the significance of religion in promoting human security is paramount. As such, the recent return to religion can be explained in ideological or psychological terms as religious movements usually emerge as reactions to the anxieties unleashed by modernization and by the failure of secularism to offer people a sense of identity and control in a fast-changing world (Lombardi and Wellman, 2012).

Accordingly, "religion is more than a belief system; it is a dynamic … mechanism that moves in time and context, expressing deep social desires, related to and overlapping many of the concerns … described in human security" (Wellman 2012, 27). Religion entails how people live and orient themselves in the world regarding their family, social, and political lives (ibid., 26). Perhaps this informed the OSCE to take education about religion/belief seriously. The organization believes that teachings about religions/beliefs have the potential to reduce harmful misunderstandings and stereotypes that could increase security vices and to foster democratic citizenship in a diverse society (OSCE 2007, 18). The OSCE therefore holds that educational systems should contain knowledge about religions/beliefs in which faith matters are maintained as personal choices (OSCE 2007). The OSCE situates the nexus of citizenship, religion, and education in the human dimension of security. We believe that the same could be adapted to human security given the commonality between both security concepts in matters of human rights, freedom of religion, and conflict prevention.

Theoretical Background to Human Security and Citizenship in RE

Human Security, Citizenship, and RE in International Context

Scholarship on human security shows little interest in RE. The major works addressing this deficit barely deal with citizenship in RE. Nevertheless, reviewing some related studies sheds more light on the research problem at hand.

According to Davies (2009), the use of education to avert extremism and religious fundamentalism is significant in security works. She argues that basic literacy alone in schools is not sufficient to avert violence, extremism, religious fundamentalism, and state terrorism. Her reason: "Many suicide bombers … have had extensive schooling in state systems, even becoming doctors trained to save lives, not take them" (ibid., 184). She thus suggests that basic literacy "needs to be combined with political literacy and critical global citizenship" (ibid., 185). This combination of basic literacy with political literacy and critical global citizenship is fundamental to realizing a form of citizenship founded on human rights. She believes that this can make young people not just consumers of the media and political and religious messages but also their critical analysts. Here, critical-mindedness is seen as an antidote for extremism founded on exclusive ideologies. Hence, the answer to extremism is not moderation but a highly critical and informed idealism within a human rights framework (Davies 2009).

Davies (2014) gives more explicit concerns about security. She challenges the status quo, which usually brands religion as a potential security threat in favor of secularization. She argues that neither religion nor secularism is safe. For her, security itself is risky and education is equally unsafe. It is rather how we handle religion, secularism, security, education, and the conflicting ideologies guiding them that determines our state of security. Hence, she canvases for damage limitation using Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS) of complexity theory as she analyzes the nexus of religion, security, and education. In other words, there is no absolute right way to address security challenges. She notes that both religious and educational undertones influence national security, hence it would be mistaken to perceive that each undertone can exclusively impact security. She holds that there are complex and unpredictable intersections in the way education and religion impact security – hence establishing the nexus of religion, security, and education (ibid.).

Davies (2014) claims that the idea of combining education and human security to address religion-related violence/crisis has not been taken seriously. Hence, she suggests that RE should be part of the core school curriculum. For her, RE should be devoid of indoctrination but made up of comparative religion perspectives dealing less with features of rituals and ceremonies and more with critical and analytical dissections of the societal role of religion – good or bad – covering human security phenomena.

Ghosh et al. (2016 6, 56–57) find education to be a "double-edged sword" capable of preventing and promoting violence and religious extremism. They also reveal that governments' responses to violence often focus on the hard-power (military intervention)

tactical and operational aspects of extremism and terrorism rather than on soft-power (educational) responses to their ideological dimensions. Hard power is not only reactive and costly; it is also less effective in preventing ideological radicalization and violence because it does not treat the ideological aspects. Hard power, according to their study, curbs the rights of citizens. It also has unintended consequences which can push people (even those that were not initially attracted by religious ideology) into extremism. Hence, they advocate a resilient/counter-narrative soft power (education) to prevent young people from being influenced by the extremism- and terrorism-oriented soft power (education). In this case, the counter-narrative soft power should promote respect, tolerance, human rights, and foster skills for critical thinking and engaged citizenship. This is to negate any soft power promoting religious extremism/exclusivism and violent ideologies. The soft power solution complements rather than replaces the hard power (Ghosh et al. 2016). Though Ghosh et al. (2016) are not explicit about human security, they seem to suggest a nexus of citizenship, religion, education, and security.

We can see from the above narrative that there is a growing consensus that education is a viable instrument to enhance security and citizenship amid increasing religion-related crises. However, the concept of human security, in this context, remains an emergent subject (Davies 2014). The narrative emphasis on human rights about religion vis-à-vis how people live together appears to be among the essentials of citizenship and human security (cf. Davies 2009; Lombardi and Wellman 2012). As all these intersect with education, the relationship between citizenship and human security in RE becomes evident (cf. ibid.; Davies 2014; Ghosh et al. 2016).

Human Security, Citizenship, and Religion in Education in Finland

There is a very little research about the nexus of human security, citizenship, and religion in Finnish education. The closest study we found on this subject is Ubani (2013). He discusses the interplay between multiculturalism, religion, and education as portrayed in Finnish national policy. Religion is conceived of, in the policy documents, as both threat and solution in an increasingly multicultural Finland. Ubani found five policy concerns regarding multiculturalism: political radicalization, ethnic relations, active citizenship, identity formation, and human dignity. On political radicalization, religion is increasingly seen as an undercurrent of conflicts. In ethnic relations, RE is linked to domestic harmony and security; as such, each religion is allowed to have its own curriculum in RE. This supports the religious identity formation of the minorities, as they receive RE in their own religion. Although Ubani (2003) connects RE with security, he is not explicit about the concept of human security.

Surprisingly, he does not explicitly connect his findings on active citizenship to religion despite his view of religion as a means of political radicalization. On human dignity, he views religion as an institution providing services aiming at human well-being (Ubani 2013).

There are several studies on citizenship in Finnish RE (Poulter 2013, 2017) and on citizenship in Finland (e.g. Piattoeva 2009; Torney-Purta 2002). However, such studies pay attention to neither security nor human security.

Religion in the Widening of Security Concerns: A Prelude to the Security Debates in RE

Gearon (2017) suggests that the emergence of security in RE is owing to the widening of security concerns as demonstrated by the involvement of OSCE in RE.[12] Hence, we review the widening of security concerns as championed by the scholars called wideners (e.g. Buzan et al. 1998; Buzan and Hansen 2009; Albert and Buzan 2011; Laustsen and Wæver 2000; Cavelty and Mauer 2012). The wideners belong to the "Copenhagen School" of security studies and they employ a critical approach to security issues. They reject the traditionalists'/realists' position: the primacy of the military in security issues. For the wideners, military security is part of rather than the whole security subject, as threats and vulnerability can arise in military and non-military contexts (ibid.; Gearon 2017, 475–476; C.A.S.E.[13] 2006). Accordingly, the wideners accept human security. As the wideners apply critical theory to security studies (Buzan and Hansen 2009, 205–208) and to security policymaking (cf. C.A.S.E. 2006, 472), they envisage that human security can enhance a more secured world.

Buzan et al. (1998) widen security to five different but interwoven sectors: military, political, economic, societal, and environmental (cf. Cavelty and Mauer 2012). The societal sector concerns the sustainability of traditional patterns of language, culture, religion, and national identity. But these concerns must conform to the acceptable conditions for evolution (Buzan, as cited in Buzan et al. 1998, 8). Accordingly, the societal sector is subject to the political (authority) sector for instance, hence indicating that the sectors are interwoven (cf. Buzan et al. 1998, 8). Meanwhile, Laustsen and Wæver (2000) have suggested that religion should be another security sector rather than being treated as part of the societal sector.[14] For them, this is necessary because religion goes beyond communal or identity issues. Religious

[12] See Gearon's critiques of this move below.

[13] C.A.S.E. is a network of researchers interested in critical security studies (C.A.S.E. 2006).

[14] It remains debatable as to whether the list of security sectors should be expanded to include more issues like religion and gender (Albert and Buzan 2011).

discourse is mainly in defense of faith, the opportunity to worship the right gods in the right ways in view of salvation (707–709).

Buzan and Hansen (2009) are probably right in noting that religion is being deepened as an empirical line of analysis in the widening of security (254).[15] The 9/11 attack and the subsequent responses have spurred the issue of religion and terrorism in literature. The traditionalists consequently move the focus of war from interstate to relations between states and non-state actors while the wideners move the core of security back towards political violence (227). Meanwhile, the security implications of religion (particularly Islam) have always been a notable post-Cold War topic among the wideners and the traditionalists. This is partly owing to the "clash of civilizations" discourse and to long-standing concerns about the Middle East (181–182).

Politicization and Securitization of RE? Critiques and Defenses

Gearon conceives of the development of security in RE as politicization and securitization of RE.[16] This, according to him, can change the aim of RE in favor of the political and security authorities (Gearon 2012a, 2012b, 2013, 2014, 2017). Gearon (2012b) sees the REDCo project, sponsored by the European Commission, as a political agenda to support political and security interests. For him, a key aim of REDCo is to support the recommendations of the Council of Europe (CoE) and the *Toledo Guiding Principles* of the OSCE (155). Gearon queries the involvement of the security authorities in preparing such materials. "For the closer and more integrally political and security organisations are concerned with religion in education (its guiding principles, even its pedagogy), the more they risk replicating the very totalizing and extremist structures they oppose" (Gearon 2012a, 231).

Gearon is critical of the new role of RE in facilitating democratic citizenship and human rights (Gearon 2012b, 164). He believes that RE should be entrenched in the religious life with a view to addressing the critical moral and existential questions central to religious concerns in human experience (Gearon 2014, 65). He seems sympathetic to the RE of Christianity rather than RE focusing on world religions and diversity in public schools in

[15] It remains debateable as to whether security sectors are generally ontological or should rather be taken as analytical devices (ibid.).

[16] He seems to understand security in RE in military terms. He notes: "The word security is now associated most commonly with the protection of national and international interests, often with militaristic overtones. It is in this sense in which 'securitization' is used" (Gearon 2012a, 216). His view that liberal democracies have become intolerant by "bringing military and security concerns into the [RE] classroom" (Gearon 2012a, 231) seems to lend credence to this.

Europe. He seems disposed towards protecting Christianity as an age-long European religious identity (Gearon 2012b, 156–157; cf. 2013, 134–135).

Jackson denies that the REDCo project was meant to support the recommendations of the CoE and the guiding principles of the OSCE on RE in public schools. According to him, the *Recommendation on Teaching about Religions and Nonreligious Convictions in Public Schools* of the CoE was published in 2008 while the *Toledo Guiding Principles on Teaching about Religions and Beliefs in Public Schools* of the OSCE was drafted and published in 2007, whereas REDCo empirical research began in 2006. Hence, Jackson notes that the REDCo project could not have been set up to support recommendations that did not yet exist[17] (Jackson 2015, 355, 357–358, 362–363).

For Jackson, it is misleading to project the *Toledo Guiding Principles* of the OSCE as politicization and securitization of RE (as Gearon does) for the following reasons: The *Toledo Guiding Principles* were produced under the auspices of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), a branch of the OSCE. The ODIHR exists to provide support and expertise to the participating states and to promote democracy, rule of law, human rights, freedom of religion/belief, tolerance, and non-discrimination. It is not involved in matters of military security. The ODIHR is concerned with what the OSCE designates as the "human dimension of security."[18] The main function of ODIHR is to produce educational materials dealing with topics such as intolerance and racism (ibid., 356–357). Arguably, the OSCE is a security organization not just because it employs military intervention but also because it promotes human rights to prevent conflicts (cf. ibid., 354; MFA 2009, 76–77).

Following Jackson, the *Toledo Guiding Principles* was prepared by people drawn from across the OSCE region with expertise in different fields such as law, politics, education, and religion.

> The key point is that no one from the OSCE or ODIHR dictated the direction of discussion or the provisional content of the document. The ODIHR maintained a coordinating and facilitating role throughout the process and relied on the expertise of the Advisory Panel and experts to develop the content of the *Toledo Guiding Principles*. (Jackson 2015, 358)

[17] Jackson was a leading researcher in the REDCo project. He also contributed to the recommendations of the CoE and the *Toledo Guiding Principles* (Jackson 2015).

[18] This is a precursor of what is now called human security (cf. Jackson 2015, 354).

Jackson concurs that educators should always be wary of being manipulated by the political authorities. He maintains, however, that support for research and/or development concerning studies of religions and non-religious worldviews is a legitimate concern for bodies like the European Commission and the OSCE/ODIHR as long as they allow participants to work freely and openly in pursuing scholarly enquiry and liberal educational goals (Ibid., 362).

Jackson notes that the REDCo project does not suggest that RE in schools should be solely justified on the basis of social issues and political events as it also deals with personal views of and commitment to religion. He claims that he personally agrees with the Delors report of UNESCO stating that education should include learning to know, learning to do, learning to live together, and learning to be. He suggests that RE should deal with all of these, particularly the fourth (Jackson 2015, 353). He disagrees, however, with Gearon's view that RE can only mean initiation into religious life. Jackson, subsequently, labels Gearon an essentialist (Jackson 2015). According to Jackson, there are two broad ways of RE, each known by different names: (1) religious nurture or religious instruction or initiation into religion and (2) education about religions or religion education or religion in education. He argues that many researchers/writers (including those of REDCo) would regard both to be valid in different contexts (ibid., 353–354).

Meanwhile, Lewin wrote an intervening article on the "Gearon-Jackson debate." He claims that Jackson's rejoinder to Gearon is "robust and largely accurate." Lewin, however, notes that Jackson's rejoinder misses the challenge that RE is now serving political purposes at the expense of our understanding of religion. Lewin is generally sympathetic to Gearon's critiques of securitization and politicization of RE (Lewin 2017). Jackson responded to Lewin by noting that every educational discourse has a political dimension and that RE, like any other field, cannot be an exception. He thus maintains his initial position (Jackson 2017). Gearon seems excited about the fact that Lewin shares his concern regarding the reduction of RE to the political. Hence, he equally maintains his earlier position even as he agrees to be called a RE essentialist (Gearon 2017). Meanwhile, Gearon (2017) identifies several security concepts (including human security). The article also clarifies the positions of the major security theory schools of thought and the functions of different security organizations (ibid., 475–476) more than his previous studies do (cf. Gearon 2012a, 216, 231).

The Gearon-Jackson debate suggests that security in RE is a very contentious political, human rights, and educational subject wherein Gearon is an antagonist while Jackson is a protagonist. However, the case is more complex than that, as Gearon was equally one of the first scholars to systematize the relationship between human rights and RE (Gearon

2002). Gearon, in this instance, acknowledges that RE has potentials to address/promote all categories of human rights (including civil and political). He believes that this can afford RE opportunities to make valid contributions to citizenship education. According to him, RE needs to do more about the political implications of teaching/learning religious traditions in order to achieve these potentials. Gearon believes that a critical approach to the combination of human rights and RE can help in dealing with world conflicts (ibid.). Gearon's commitment to human rights issues is further demonstrated in his handbook on human rights – a guide for teachers/students/researchers. The handbook aims at integrating human rights into all primary and secondary schools' subjects (Gearon 2003; de Forest 2004). However, the handbook neither gives any specific suggestions as to how teachers can effectively integrate human rights into classrooms nor offers any suggestions as to how teachers/students can become human rights activists (de Forest 2004).

The above discourse suggests that Gearon's polemic is an elaboration and analysis of the complexity and elements of national and global security. His polemics seem not mutually exclusive to a notion of human security, human rights, and citizenship relating to RE. They are rather an embedded part of it. Central to Gearon's (2015) polemics is that scholars' task is not that of state spies. Even Jackson (2016) warns that the state policy aiming at fighting terrorism through RE should not slip towards authoritarianism whereby dissent is policed/stifled or alternative perspectives are opposed. Jackson advises that the state initiative should, as far as possible, promote discussion/dialogue in RE within human rights parameters. (Davies 2016 gives similar warnings/sentiments.) These suggest that Gearon's concern about securitization/militarization/politicization of RE is hardly dismissive.

Considering the Gearon-Jackson debate, Jackson seems right in calling Gearon an essentialist of RE and Gearon seems right in accepting such labeling (Jackson 2015; Gearon 2017). However, a combination of Gearon's polemical and non-polemical stances about human rights, human security and citizenship in RE raises a question as to whether we can unreservedly call Gearon an essentialist of RE. Besides, Gearon's protective disposition towards Christian RE (as a bearer of European religious values and identity) at the expense of today's religious diversity raises another question. The issue here is whether such a disposition is not a sort of politicization and securitization of RE and Christianity (cf. Davies 2014, 10). We recommend these as questions for further debates about human rights and RE in which essentialism, politicization, and securitization can receive more attention.

Scope and Limitations

In this article, the study of human security and citizenship in RE within the human rights horizon is couched as a general issue wherein Finland is a case study. We use policy documents as our empirical data, so our findings may not reflect what people actually experience. Our research about security and human security is restricted to security education/security studies, excluding peace education/peace studies. The debates regarding security and human security in this study exclude those between the Traditionalist/Realist School and the Copenhagen School and their cognates. We rather focus on the debates about the widening of security concerns with emphasis on religion. The debates also focus on security and human security relating to citizenship in RE in public schools.

Analysis of Policy Documents about Human Security vis-à-vis Citizenship in Finnish RE

In this section, we analyze the visibility of human security in the development of citizenship in relation to education and religion in the selected policy documents. We do this within this research's conceptual framework and some relevant theories and concepts emanating from previous studies. Our analysis employs the following categorizations: (a) psychological threats as human security threats amid growing diversity, (b) towards a nexus between citizenship and security in RE, and (c) thinking of human rights relating to citizenship in RE as human security. These categorizations are not exclusive. They are simply different perspectives on the questions in view.

Psychological Threats as Human Security Threats amid Growing Diversity

Päivi Räsänen[19] declares that Finland is relatively safe (Räsänen 2012, 4). Similarly, the MoI (2013, 12) states: "Finland is an open and safe country." The description of Finland as a safe country should be taken cautiously. At least, the government acknowledges the "two school killings in Finland; one in Jokela in November 2007 and the other in Kauhajoki in September 2008" as security lapses (MoI 2012, 17), though the killings were not linked to religion. Following the MoI, in Finland

> extremist violence poses no threat to state structures. It can be evaluated as mainly posing a potential security risk to individual people ... Such a threat may also be targeted at certain foreign interests located in our country, such as embassies. However, the possibility of a single, radicalised individual carrying out an act of terrorism or violence cannot be ruled out in Finland. (ibid.)

The possibility of extremist violence posing potential security risks to individual persons in Finland is being associated with increasing religious and ethnic diversity in

[19] Finland Minister of the Interior in 2012

Finland (MoI 2013, 12). MoI (2008, 9) notes that "Finland is rapidly becoming … more multicultural." Recent demography shows that there were just over 26,000 foreigners in Finland in 1990. This rose to almost 122,000 (2.5% of the country's population) by 2006 (MoI 2008). "At the end of 2011 … the number of people of foreign origin permanently residing in the country was 257,000 or about 5% of the total population. Approximately 220,000 of these people were born abroad, and about 37,500 in Finland" (MoI 2013, 5). The number of persons having foreign background living in Finland by the end of 2016 was 364,787 (c. 6.6% of the total population). Of these persons, 306,840 were born abroad while 57,947 were born in Finland.[20] This is already more than an earlier population projection stating "that in 2020 Finland will have about 345,000 foreign nationals" (ibid., 11).

The above demographics may appear insignificant when compared with the influx of immigrants to many other countries (e.g., the US and UK). Such viewpoints, however, will be misleading for the following reasons: (1) For most of its history, Finland, except for its "old" minorities (Swedish speaking Finns, Romani, and Sami), was fairly homogenous. (2) The major "opening" of the Finnish borders to immigrants only began when Finland joined the CoE in 1989 and the European Union in 1995. (3) This led to the relative influx of foreigners from the former Soviet Union, Somalia, the former Yugoslavia, Iran, and Iraq in the 1990s. Since then, there has been a steady and relatively diverse influx of foreigners to Finland (Talib 2006; Piattoeva 2009).

Increasing immigration to Finland is associated with the terms multiculturalism and diversity. Multiculturalism and diversity connote increasing different cultural and religious backgrounds of the immigrants. The increase in multiculturalism or diversity is expected to linger into the near future (MoI 2008; 2013). The government perceives that growing multiculturalism/diversity has positive and negative potentials in Finland. It notes that "increased multiculturalism involves many new opportunities for Finland" (MoI 2008, 9). However, "[i]t is up to society as a whole – the political system, the authorities, the business sector and citizens – how well we will be able to leverage the positive factors and prevent the rise of factors that jeopardise security" (ibid.). Accordingly,

> Respect for people's differences and openness to new ideas will be the key to positive interaction … However, an increase in diversity will also bring the risk of a growth in inequality in society, and there are already examples of this elsewhere in Europe.

[20] See Statistics Finland: http://www.stat.fi/index_en.html. Accessed 15 July 2017

> Possible conflicts between different cultures, religions and values could weaken the internal cohesiveness of society and exacerbate inequality in society. (MoI 2013, 12)

Maximization of the positive potentials of diversity (religious/cultural) is being hampered on the following basis:

> Finland has had relatively little experience as a host country for migrants, and this is perhaps one explanation for the dominance of rather negative views of migration among Finns, whereby internationalisation and migration have been seen as a threat to national culture. (ibid., 9)

The fear of many Finns about the preservation of their national culture is connected to religion. In the previous NCCBE, "[r]eligion is treated as one of the undercurrents influencing human culture" (FNBE 2004, 202). This sentiment is reiterated in the new NCCBE (effected August 2016) stating that the "[c]ontents discussed in the teaching and learning include … knowledge of religions as a part of cultural general knowledge" (FNBE 2014, 436). Aptly put: "In Finnish culture 'church' epitomizes religion" (Ubani and Tirri 2006, 362). Hence, the increasing presence of other faiths (especially non-Christian faiths) might have been perceived as threats to the long-standing Finnish Christian traditions epitomized in Lutheranism and Orthodoxies. Note that Lutheran and Orthodox churches are officially akin to the Finnish state churches to date (cf. Ubani 2013).

The concern of many Finns to preserve their national culture (religion) amidst increasing diversity appears as a religion and human security issue. In this case, the sense of insecurity for many Finns is about preservation of their national religion/culture rather than the dread of a cataclysmic world event (cf. UNDP 1994, 22–23). This portends a psychological dimension of religion and human security (cf. ibid.; Lombardi and Wellman 2012) whereby the migrants are seen as security threats. Meanwhile, the negative attitude of many Finns towards ethnic minorities (of foreign descent) is slowly becoming positive (MoI 2008, 9). Yet the "ethnic minorities are still viewed with mixed feelings, but those who view immigrants with a negative attitude do not perceive their opinions as racism but as 'cautious wisdom'" (ibid.). Following the government, "[u]nderlying the negative attitudes are insufficient knowledge about ethnic minorities, their cultures and their religions" (ibid.).

An investigation about terrorism launched in September 2011 indicates that the "Muslim community in Finland is heterogenic and mainly moderate. Violent, radical Islamic views are not connected with communities in Finland, but are problematic at individual level" (MoI 2012, 17). However,

> [t]here are clear indications of attempts made in Finland to support Islamist-motivated terrorist activities in the individuals' countries of origin, or in a conflict zone. It is also suspected that radical Islamic individuals residing in Finland have participated in fighting carried out by terrorist groups, or in weapons training in crisis zones. (ibid.)

The Finnish case suggests that religion can be expressed as patriotism/nationalism, which could in turn impact personal security (human security). This is evident in the fear, by many Finns, of losing the nation's Christian heritage as religious diversity grows. It also indicates that religion can impact beliefs in a manner that influences not only private but also public behavior as the government attempts to manage the development. This is reflected in the government policy interventions, which in turn impact the freedom from fear of Finns, foreigners, Christians, and non-Christians (cf. Lombardi and Wellman 2012; Gasper 2005). We treat the policy interventions in more detail in the subsequent sections.

Towards a Nexus between Citizenship and Security in RE

One major policy intervention of Finland in managing the prevailing fears, possible threats and their potential security risks against personal security (individual persons) is civic education. Accordingly, the ministry of education is saddled with this responsibility (Security and Defence Committee 2006, 43–44). The government policy reads in part:

> The development of education will take into account the possibilities of conveying information on threats and preparedness by means of civic education. Topics promoting psychological crisis tolerance are developed both for curricula and curriculum-based education. Pupils and students receive education on the … responsible conduct in life's different situations as well as total defence and security policy. (ibid., 44)

Citizenship in RE is a cross-curricular theme in the previous national curriculum (FNBE 2004). However, the new national curriculum expressly connects global citizenship to RE whereby "[t]he instruction of religion supports the pupil's growth into a responsible member of his or her community and the democratic society as well as a global citizen" (FNBE 2014, 435). This means Ubani's (2013) finding stating that active citizenship is not explicitly tied to religion in Finnish policy is no longer tenable.

Finland designates RE as a security strengthening subject, as it views religion in education as an instrument to facilitate good ethnic relations, integration, and security. According to the MoI (2008), "[p]romoting good ethnic relations and integration … helps improve the security of the individual and of society as a whole" (31). In order to realize this, the ministry further says that "[i]t is important for good ethnic relations that both the majority

population and the ethnic minorities have sufficient information about other cultures and other religions" (ibid., 32). This policy seems harmonized in the new curriculum. "In teaching and learning, the pupils get … acquainted with the traditions related to religions and worldviews in Finland as well as religions elsewhere in the world" (FNBE 2014, 435).

For Finland, the policy promoting study about religions should not be done at the expense of one's own religion, culture, and identity. "Knowledge of one's own culture and religion also significantly aids the building and managing of one's own identity" (ibid.). This policy orientation might have informed the adoption of the RE model in 2003 whereby every pupil receives RE in his/her own religion (Section 13 of the Basic Education Act 628/1998; Amendments up to 1136/2010).[21] The "right to one's own religion and teaching of religion enshrined in the Constitution and in the Freedom of Religion Act [is guaranteed and] implemented in practice" (MoI 2008, 36; cf. FNBE 2014, 439). This conforms with the present Finnish policy of integration as against its previous policy of assimilation obtaining until the 1990s (Ubani 2013; cf. MoI 2013). In the past, minorities could only receive RE in the religion of the majority until the NCCBE of 2004 came into force (cf. Ubani 2013, 199).

The above analysis indicates that the Finnish policy documents promote a nexus between citizenship and security in matters of RE. It seems there is a correlation between this and the viewpoint of the OSCE expressed within the context of the human dimension of security. Like the OSCE (2007, 18), the Finnish government believes that knowledge about religions/beliefs can foster democratic citizenship (FNBE 2014, 435), freedom of religion, and promote understanding and security among diverse ethnic/religious groups (MoI 2008, 31–32). It seems the human dimension of security (OSCE) principles above can be applied in the context of human security (UN), given the commonality between both security concepts, particularly in matters of freedom of religion and conflict prevention.

Thinking of Human Rights relating to Citizenship in RE as Human Security

As noted already, Finnish RE has been designated as a means of promoting global citizenship among young people. However, the new curriculum (FNBE 2014) overtly places significance on human rights in attaining this objective. Contrary to the previous NCCBE (FNBE 2004), the new curriculum explicitly states that the teaching of religious ethics in each RE (except in that of Catholic) should be harmonized with the "UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights" and "human rights ethics." That of the Orthodox, in addition, includes the "UN Convention on the Rights of the Child" (FNBE 2014, 435–442). The idea of incorporating

[21] See: http://www.finlex.fi/en/laki/kaannokset/1998/en19980628.pdf. Accessed 21 November 2015

human rights into instruction about religions reflects the global dimension of security. Finland lends credence to this as it seeks to support a multilateral system (UN inclusive) and to advance "global security" through "the promotion of human rights, the rule of law and democracy" (PMO 2013, 81–82). Moreover, its policy documents reveal that there is "interdependence of *human rights, security and development* … in multilateral fora and at country level" (MFA 2009, 10; cf. 1995, 15–16) (emphasis original).

Human security is not currently explicitly connected to citizenship in RE in the NCCBE. However, it seems the human rights perspectives newly introduced into the subject arguably connote human security. This postulation is possible if viewed from the perspective of the UN Commission on Human Security. The commission notes that respecting human rights is central in protecting human security. Hence both are mutually reinforcing.

> Human security helps identify the rights at stake in a particular situation. And human rights help answer the question: How should human security be promoted? The notion of duties and obligations complements the recognition of the ethical … importance of human security. (Commission on Human Security 2003, 10)

The concept of human security is yet to gain wide currency in Finnish policy documents. Unlike the case of human rights, there is yet no government report primarily on Finland's human security policy submitted to the Finnish parliament. Finland's human security policy is usually embedded in its human rights reports in scanty form. Hence, the concept of human security in Finnish policies is a matter of latent content. Of Finland's three human rights policy reports submitted to the parliament (i.e., MFA 2004, 2009, 2014), two (those of 2004 and 2009) seem to explicitly refer to human security. Rather than explicitly expatiating on the concept of human security,

> Finland seeks to ensure that the interdependence of *human rights, security and development* is considered … at country level. Ways of ensuring this include mainstreaming the safeguarding of human rights, [and] developing practical applications of the *concept of human security* … particularly in the protection of civilian populations and conflict prevention. (MFA 2009, 10–11) (emphasis original)

The citation above seems to reiterate the idea that the practice of human rights cannot be separated from not only security but also human security. Hence, it seems tenable to think of the fundamentals of human rights connected to citizenship in Finnish RE in terms of human security.

Meanwhile, the new curriculum (FNBE 2014) seems to portray global citizenship in Finnish RE as a sort of critical global citizenship. Explicit ideas about human rights vis-à-vis

the ethical issues in the new RE curriculum (ibid.) appear to lend credence to this.[22] Besides, the new curriculum is explicit about guiding the pupils "towards critical thinking" (ibid., 435). As such, global citizenship in the present Finnish RE seems to tilt towards critical idealism within the framework of rights, as it now goes beyond the traditional rhetoric of tolerance, mutual respect, and peaceful co-existence. The conscious effort to have a form of citizenship in Finnish RE founded on human rights could make the pupils not mere consumers of religious messages from the media but also critical analysts of them (cf. Davies 2009). Interestingly, the new RE curriculum stipulates that the pupils will "learn to identify and analyse religious themes" arising from the "media" (FNBE 2014, 435). The new curriculum further reinforces the idea of critical orientation, as the fundamentals of religious ethics on which citizenship in RE must be based are not merely of the pupil's own religion. They must also be non-confessional: "Education shall not demand or lead to religious … commitment of the pupils" (ibid., 16). The intended pedagogical neutrality is further noted thus:

> In teaching and learning, the pupils familiarise themselves with ethical thinking in the studied religion and in other religions, and they are encouraged in personal reflection on ethical questions. The instruction supports the pupils' self-knowledge, self-appreciation, and the development of management skills ... The instruction provides the pupil with elements for building and evaluating his or her identity as well as personal view of life and worldview. (ibid., 435)

The idea of critical global citizenship implied in the new RE curriculum indicates Finnish political will to avert possible ideologies that could be inimical to the security of the citizens. This intervention appears as a counter-narrative and religious soft power (education) to prevent young people from being radicalized through religious fundamentalism and terrorism-oriented soft power (education). This can promote mutual respect and tolerance and foster skills for critical thinking and engaged citizenship within a human rights framework (cf. Ghosh et al. 2016; Davies 2009; MoI 2012). We believe that this is intrinsically human security, as it is proactive rather than reactive.

Concluding Discussion

This paper indicates that the security concerns in Finnish RE are related to human security whereby personal security is evident. It discusses citizenship in Finnish RE in relation to human security. It approaches this by tracing the nexus of security, religion, citizenship, and

[22] This development is significant, as human rights are not explicit in the previous RE curriculum (FNBE 2004).

education in Finnish policy documents and juxtaposing them with the relevant UN policy. The findings show that Finland explicitly aims at using education about religion to enhance security. The features of citizenship in RE are found central to this objective.

The study shows that human security (1) is not just about protection against physical violence; (2) is about freedom from fear – the mental or psychological dimension; (3) is about enjoyment of rights under the rule of law – the juridical dimension; and (4) has global implications – the universal dimension (cf. Lombardi and Wellman 2012, 1–8; UNDP 1994, 22–40). These four essentials of human security seem to be broadly captured in a UN definition stating that human security is "the liberation of human beings from those intense, extensive, prolonged, and comprehensive threats to which their lives and freedom are vulnerable" (UNDP 2009, 23). The four essentials of human security seem to be encapsulated in citizenship in Finnish RE. This is evident in the narrative below:

On freedom from fear, the fear of many Finns for their Christian heritage/identity amidst increasing religious diversity makes them view immigrants as threats. The Finnish government addresses this problem by ensuring that both Finns and immigrants learn the cultures and religions of each other in order to promote mutual understanding and good ethnic relations and enhance security. We believe that the immediate context of security in this case is emotional and psychological. Hence, it seems that the psychological crisis tolerance ideology connected with civics education and curriculum-based education in Finland reflects the psychological dimension of human security (cf. ibid.; MoI 2013, 9; 2008, 9; Security and Defence Committee 2006, 44).

Moreover, the possible fears of assimilation and loss of identity are being allayed by introducing a model of RE that allows every pupil to receive RE according to his or her own religion. This could enhance integration rather than assimilation of immigrants as each pupil receives RE according to his or her own religion rather than according to that of the majority. This seems to have the potential to give emotional/mental security about religious identity to both the majority and minorities. The Finnish model of RE is also significant if viewed in the light of the UN policy addressing the possible fears of parents regarding the RE of their children in public schools. The UN is concerned that parents, especially members of religious minorities, may fear that the schools could alienate their children from the religious tradition and values of their families (UN 2010, 8). Hence, the present model of Finnish RE further enhances personal security (human security) as it attempts to treat such psychological insecurity.

The introduction of explicit human rights issues into ethical questions in the new RE curriculum (FNBE 2014, 435–442) and the idea of freedom of religion in the policy documents generally indicate the juridical aspects of human security (cf. Lombardi and Wellman 2012, 8). This paper also reveals that human rights, security, and development are interdependent. These are shared values between Finland and the UN. This perhaps led Finland to promote the UN World Summit report stating that "humanity will not enjoy security without development, it will not enjoy development without security and it will not enjoy either without respect for human rights" (MFA 2009, 37). Development in this context seems to deal with human and social capital as they both promote individual and social well-being and development: "Human capital consists of competence, whereas social capital comprises contacts, interaction and trust between people" (FNBE 2014, 19). Finland designed its basic education for the development of human and social capital (ibid.). We believe Finnish RE, specifically, is important in developing human and social capital because it promotes competence in global citizenship with values that could foster mutual understanding and trust as people interact among themselves.

With its ethical, critical, and human rights values, Finnish RE promotes responsible global citizenship (ibid., 435). This suggests a sort of critical global citizenship in the teaching of religion, which can help pupils to be not just consumers but also critical analysts of religious, media and political messages. As such, they may not be swayed by any ideologies (soft power) that could be inimical to human security. The global essence of citizenship in Finnish RE seems to correlate with the universal concern of human security (cf. Davies 2009; UNDP 1994). Put simply, citizenship in Finnish RE seeks to impact how people relate in the world as human security impacts how people live across the globe.

The foregoing is antithetical to physical violence against any persons. This is also characteristically human security.

According to the above discussion, the security concerns in the Finnish policies relating to Finnish RE deal with the personal security (human security) of individual Finns and immigrants. The personal security concerns generally deal with freedom from fear regarding sustenance of religious practices/pattern/identities. Finland addresses this to prevent conflicts between Finns and immigrants and to promote sustainable development. Having interest in human security, Finland shuns the idea of state security that prioritizes the state as the reverent object of security. Accordingly, this study finds answers to the questions that human security poses to the security problem regarding religion in Finland: In this case, personal security is the answer to the question of security of whom. Freedom from fear about

religious assimilation and loss of religious heritage and identity is an answer to the question of security from what. The Finnish recognition that education (not necessarily the military/intelligence) is the solution to religion-related security threats is an answer to the question of security by what means (cf. Tadjabakhsh and Chenoy 2007; UNDP 1994).

Nevertheless, human security seems to have a currency deficit in Finnish policy documents. However, the government seeks to improve on this. "*Finland will work to promote a more in-depth approach to human security and endeavour to find new ways of applying it in practice*" (MFA 2009, 37) (emphasis original). Hence, we recommend that human security be explicitly integrated into the next RE curriculum in Finland. As human rights issues are currently embedded in the Finnish RE curriculum, we believe integrating human security into the same curriculum will deepen thinking about security within the human rights horizon in relation to global citizenship. This will likely enhance the approach to human security and offer new ways of practicalizing it in Finland and beyond. Meanwhile, incorporating human security into the RE curriculum should not be used as a policing strategy. Otherwise, the human security of those with dissent can be threatened, as they may be living in fear (Davies 2016).

References

Albert M, Buzan B (2011) Securitization, sectors and functional differentiation. *Security Dialogue* 42:413–425

Berg BL (2009) *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Allyn & Bacon, Boston

Bryman A (2004) *Social research methods*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Buzan B, Hansen L (2009) *The evolution of international security studies*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Buzan B, Wæver O, de Wilder J (1998) *Security: A new framework*. Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder

C.A.S.E. C (2006) Critical approaches to security in Europe: A networked manifesto. *Security Dialogue* 37:443–487

Cavelty MD, Mauer V (2012) Introduction. In: Cavelty MD, Mauer V (eds) *The Routledge handbook of security studies*. Routledge, New York, pp 1–6

Commission on Human Security (2003) *Human security now*. Commission on Human Security, New York

Davies L (2009) Educating against extremism: Towards a critical politicisation of young people. *International Review of Education* 55:183–203

Davies L (2014) *Unsafe gods: Security, secularism and schooling*. Institute of Education Press, London

Davies L (2016) Security, extremism and education: Safeguarding or surveillance? *British Journal of Educational Studies* 64:1–19

de Forest J (2004) The human rights handbook: A global perspective for education by Liam Gearon. *Harvard Educational Review* 74:340–346

FNBE (2004) *National Core Curriculum for Basic Education 2004: National Core Curriculum for Basic Education Intended for Pupils in Compulsory Education*. (Publication Reg. No 1/011/2004). FNBE, Helsinki

FNBE (2014) *National Core Curriculum for Basic Education 2014*. (Publications 2016: 5). FNBE, Helsinki

Gasper D (2005) Securing humanity: Situating 'Human Security' as concept and discourse. *Journal of Human Development* 6:221–245

Gearon L (2002) Human rights and religious education: Some postcolonial perspectives. *British Journal of Religious Education* 24:140–151

Gearon L (2003) *The human rights handbook: A global perspective for education*. Trentham, Oakhill

Gearon L (2012a) The securitization of religion in education. In: Van Der Zee T, Lovat T (eds) *New Perspectives on Religious and Spiritual Education*. Waxmann, Münster, pp 215–233

Gearon L (2012b) European religious education and European civil religion. *British Journal of Educational Studies* 60:151–169

Gearon L (2013) The counter terrorist classroom: Religion, education, and security. *Religious Education* 108:129–147

Gearon L (2014) The counter terrorist classroom: Countering extremism through (religious) education? In: Cere D, Thorp T (eds) *Religion and conflict: Responding to the challenges*. Tony Blair Faith Foundation, London, pp 64–69. https://jliflc.com/wp/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Global-Perspective-Volume-01.pdf. Accessed 1 November 2017

Gearon L (2015) Education, security and intelligence studies. *British Journal of Educational Studies* 63:263–279

Gearon L (2017) Secularisation and the securitisation of the sacred a response to Lewin's framing of the Gearon–Jackson debate. *British Journal of Educational Studies* 65: 469–480

Ghosh R, Manuel A, Chan WYA, Dilimulati M, Babaei M (2016) *Education and security: A global literature review on the role of education in countering violent religious extremism*. Tony Blair Institute for Global Change, London. https://institute.global/sites/default/files/inline-files/IGC_Education%20and%20Security.pdf. Accessed 1 November 2017.

Hoover DR (2004) Introduction: Religion gets real. In: Seiple RA, Hoover DR (eds) *Religion and security: The new nexus in international relations*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Lanham, pp 1–7

Jackson R (2015) The politicisation and securitisation of religious education? A rejoinder. *British Journal of Educational Sciences* 63:345–366

Jackson R (2016) Inclusive study of religions and world views in schools: Signposts from the Council of Europe. *Social Inclusion* 4:14–25

Jackson R (2017) 'Who's afraid of secularisation?' A response to David Lewin. *British Journal of Educational Studies* 65:463–468

Laustsen CB, Wæver O (2000) In defence of religion: Sacred referent objects for securitization. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 29:705–739

Lewin D (2017) Who's afraid of secularisation? Reframing the debate between Gearon and Jackson. *British Journal of Educational Studies* 65:445–461

Lombardi CB, Wellman JKJr (2012) Introduction: Religion and human security: An understudied relationship. In: Wellman JKJr, Lombardi CB (eds) *Religion and human security: A global perspective*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp 1– 17

MFA (1995) *Security in a changing world: Guidelines for Finland's security policy - report by the Council of State to the parliament 6 June 1995*. (Report No. 8/1995).

MFA (2004) *Government report to parliament on the human rights policy of Finland 2004*. (Report No. 5/2004). http://formin.finland.fi/public/default.aspx?contentid=324178&nodeid=49540&contentlan=2&culture=en-US. Accessed 8 October 2017

MFA (2009) *Government report to parliament on the human rights policy of Finland 2009*. (Report No. 14/2009). http://formin.finland.fi/public/default.aspx?contentid=324113&contentlan=2&culture=en-US. Accessed 17 July 2017

MFA (2014) *Government of Finland human rights report 2014*. http://formin.finland.fi/public/default.aspx?contentid=324091&nodeid=49540&contentlan=2&culture=en-US. Accessed 8 June 2017

MoI (2008) *Safety first: Internal security programme*. (Publication No. 25/2008). http://www.hare.vn.fi/Uploads/14424/403391/JULKAISU_20090721073036_403391.pdf. Accessed 16 May 2017

MoI (2012) *Towards a cohesive society: Action plan to prevent violent extremism.* (Publication No. 33/2012). http://julkaisut.valtioneuvosto.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/79460/sm_332012.pdf. Accessed 21 June 2017

MoI (2013) *Government resolution on the future of migration 2020 strategy*. http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/Treaties/CERD/Shared%20Documents/FIN/INT_CERD_ADR_FIN_22740_E.pdf. Accessed 21 June 2017

OSCE (2007) *Toledo guiding principles on teaching about religions and beliefs in public schools*. OSCE/ODIHR, Warsaw. http://www.osce.org/odihr/29154?download=true. Accessed 17 January 2017

Piattoeva N (2009) Citizenship and nationality in changing Europe: A comparative study of the aims of citizenship education in Russian and Finnish national education policy texts. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 41:723–744

Poulter S (2013) *Kansalaisena maallistuneessa maailmassa. Koulun uskonnonopetuksen yhteiskunnallisen tehtävän tarkastelua*. [Citizenship in a secular age. The civic task of religious education]. Dissertation, University of Tampere

Poulter S (2017) From citizenship of God's kingdom to liberal individualism? A critical historical analysis of Finnish religious education. *British Journal of Religious Education* 39:187–206

PMO (2013) *Finnish security and defence policy 2012: Government report*. (Report No. 1/2013). http://vnk.fi/julkaisu?pubid=2205. Accessed 15 August 2017

Räsänen P (2012) To the reader. In *Towards a cohesive society: Action plan to prevent violent extremism*. MoI, Helsinki, p 4

Tadjbakhsh S, Chenoy AM (2007) *Human security: concepts and implications*. Routledge, London

Schreier M (2012) *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. Sage, Los Angeles.

Security and Defence Committee (2006) *The strategy for securing the functions vital to society*. (Government Resolution 23.11.2006). http://www.defmin.fi/files/858/06_12_12_YETTS__in_english.pdf. Accessed 12 March 2017

Seiple C, Hoover DR, Otis P (2013) Introduction. In: Seiple C, Hoover DR, Otis P (eds) *The Routledge handbook of religion and security*. Routledge, London, pp 1–8

Simola H (2000) Firmly bolted into the air: Wishful rationalism as a discursive basis for educational reforms. In: Ball SJ (ed) *Sociology of education: Major themes*. (Vol. 4). London, Routledge, pp 2112–2138

Talib M (2006) Why is it so hard to encounter diversity? In: Talib M (ed) *Diversity: A challenge for educators*. Finnish Educational Research Association, Turku, pp 139–156

Torney-Purta J (2002) The school's role in developing civic engagement: A study of adolescents in twenty-eight countries. *Applied Developmental Science* 6:203– 212

Ubani M, Tirri K (2006) How do Finnish pre-adolescents perceive religion and spirituality? *International Journal of Children's Spirituality* 11:357–370

Ubani M (2013) Threats and solutions: Multiculturalism, religion and educational policy. *Intercultural Education* 24:195–210

UN (2010) *Report of the special rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief, Heiner Bielefeldt*. Human Rights Council

UNDP (1994) *Human development report 1994*. Oxford University Press, New York

UNDP (2009) *Arab human development report 2009: Challenges to human security in Arab countries*. UNDP, New York

Weisse W (2007) The European research project on religion and education 'REDCo': An introduction. In: Jackson R, Miedema S, Weisse W, Williaime J (eds) *Religion and education in Europe: Developments, contexts and debates*. Waxmann, New York, pp 9–25

Wellman JKJr (2012) The dance of desire in religion and human security. In: Wellman JKJr, Lombardi CB (eds) *Religion and human security: A global perspective*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp 18–29